

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the office action mailed September 24, 2003, which states that applicant's submission filed on June 3, 2002 was not fully responsive to the prior office action (mailed May 10, 2002), because it does not give any arguments of how the previous rejections have been overcome. The September 24th action states that the response should provide an explanation of how the newly submitted claims differ from the claims that were rejected in the prior Office action, and should also provide a brief explanation of how the present claims differ from claims in the parent applications which have issued as patents.

As noted in applicant's June 3, 2002 submission, applicant's preliminary amendment mailed May 6, 2002, crossed in the mails with the office action mailed May 10, 2002. The May 6th preliminary amendment amended the application, by a new title, addition of cross-reference to related applications, cancellation of Claims 1-20 and addition of new claims 27-49.

In the May 10th office action, Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 USC 101, for double patenting, as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-10 of U.S. 5,932,973. Claims 11-20 were rejected for double patenting, as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-10 of U.S. 6,174,271. The May 6th amendment mooted these double patenting rejections.

Differences Between Newly Submitted, Rejected and Issued Claims

Claim 27 differs from application Claim 1, in that the recitation "high throughput" found in the preamble of Claim 1 does not appear in Claim 27. Claim 27 includes the limitations "first ganged set of spindles" and "second ganged set of spindles;" Claim 1 did not include the "ganged" limitation. Similar differences exist with respect to Claim 1 of U.S. 5,920,973.

Claims 28-38 depend from Claim 27, and thus also incorporate these differences.

The newly submitted claims do not include the "toolchanger..." and "controller..." limitations as recited in application Claim 11, or in Claim 1 of U.S. 6,174,271.

Independent Claims 37 and 41 each recites "a ganged set of a plurality of spindles..." and neither claim includes a second set of spindles or a second spindle linear drive system as recited in Claim 1. Claims 38-40 depend from Claim 37. Claims 42-49 depend, directly or indirectly, from Claim 42.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Larry K. Roberts
Registration No. 28,464

Dated: 12/16/03

Law Offices of Larry K. Roberts, Inc.
P.O. Box 8569
Newport Beach, CA 92658-8569
Telephone (949) 640-6200
Facsimile (949) 640-1206